

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1 and 7 have been amended, and claim 2 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 10-20 are withdrawn from further consideration. Accordingly, claims 1 and 3-9 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1 and 7 are independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 7-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Japanese Patent Application Publication No. 2001-319583 applied for by Kado, *et al.* ("Kado") in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,985,069 issued to Kawabe, *et al.* ("Kawabe").

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the reference or references, when combined, must disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations. The motivation to modify the prior art and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based upon a patent applicant's disclosure. See *in re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Assuming *arguendo* that the references may be combined and a reasonable expectation of success exists, the combined references do not disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations. By this amendment, claim 1 now contains the limitations of the canceled claim 2.

Amended claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

A plasma display panel, comprising:

...

wherein the sealant is formed of regions having a first width of substantially the same size and regions having a second width, wherein the second width is greater than the first width, the sealant having a *substantially uniform thickness*, wherein the regions of the sealant having the second width are located at *areas where a sealing pressure is concentrated*. (emphasis added)

The combined references fail to teach or suggest at least these features. Applicants agree with the Examiner that Kado does not disclose the sealant is formed having substantially uniform thickness (Office Action, page 3, lines 3-4). However, Applicants respectfully disagree with the conclusion in the Office Action that the claimed invention is allegedly obvious over Kado in view of Kawabe that teaches forming a sealant with a uniform thickness (Office Action, page 3, lines 12-14).

Kawabe teaches variation in dispensing a sealing material at the starting and ending points to avoid thicker sealing material at these points *during the dispensing procedure* (Kawabe, Fig. 2, Col. 6, line 41 – Col. 7, line 7). In other words, Kawabe teaches that the sealing material is deposited with a uniform thickness. Kawabe also teaches *using clips* to fix stacked glass substrates 1 and 2 (Kawabe, Col. 7, lines 12-14). However, no recognition is found in Kawabe that a thickness variation of sealant (frit) may be caused due to the application of sealant clips. In other words, Kawabe is silent about a thickness variation of frit *in an assembled PDP*. Thus, Kawabe has the same defect as Kado. On the other hand, Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) teaches that the frit in the region where the sealant clips are provided becomes thinner than the frit in regions where the sealant clips are not provided (a difference of approximately 20~40µm results) (AAPA, page 2, lines 17-19). Because Kawabe teaches no more than what is disclosed in AAPA, a skilled artisan can easily infer that an assembled PDP resulting from the teachings of Kawabe would suffer the setbacks described in AAPA. Consequently, Applicants respectfully assert that the invention recited in claim 1 is patentable over the assembled PDP according to the teachings of Kado and Kawabe.

Additionally, neither Kado nor Kawabe teaches or suggests the feature of claim 1 that “the regions of the sealant having the second width are located at areas where a sealing pressure is concentrated.”

Even if Kado and Kawabe are combined with U. S. Patent No. 6,817,917 issued to Kado, *et al.* (“Kado ‘917”), which is the reference applied to the canceled claim 2, the combined references still fail to teach or suggest such features because Kado ‘917 fails to cure the deficiencies of Kado and Kawabe noted above.

Therefore, Applicants respectively submit that, at least because neither Kado nor Kawabe nor Kado ‘917 discloses such features, the combined references fail to teach or suggest every feature of claim 1.

Claim 7 has similar features, and hence, cannot be rendered obvious over Kado in view of Kawabe for at least the reasons noted above with respect to claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1 and 7. Claims 3-5 and 8-9 depend from claims 1 and 7, respectively, and are allowable at least for this reason. Since none of the other prior art of record, whether taken alone or in any combination, discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 7, and all the claims that depend therefrom, are allowable.

Claims 2 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Kado, Kawabe, and further in view of Kado ‘917. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 2 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, thereby rendering the rejection moot.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over Kado and Kawabe, and Kado '917 fails to cure the deficiencies of Kado and Kawabe noted above with regard to claim 1. Hence, claim 6 is allowable at least because it depends from an allowable claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 2 and 6.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submit that all of the stated grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/hae-chan park/

Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: January 16, 2007

CUSTOMER NO. 58027
H.C. Park & Associates, PLC
8500 Leesburg Pike
Suite 7500
Vienna, VA 22182
Tel: 703-288-5105
Fax: 703-288-5139
HCP:RTS/alj